

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-7, drawn to a method of routing an electronic trace, classified in class 29, subclass 830.
 - II. Claims 8-15, drawn to printed circuit board, classified in class 361, subclass 794.
 - III. Claims 16-20, drawn to an information handling system, classified in class 361, subclass 764.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions Group I and Group II-III are related as process of making and product made.

The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the products of Groups II-III as claim can be made by another and materially different process such as forming a voltage plane on a first layer and a ground plane on the bottom or second layer of the PCB.

3. Inventions Group II and Group III are related as combination and subcombination.

Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination

Art Unit: 3729

as claimed because invention of Group II does not require a memory coupling to the processor.

The subcombination has separate utility such as handling information.

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and the search required for one Group is not required for other Groups, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. During a telephone conversation with Szymczak, Brian on October 18, 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group III, claims 16-20 and canceled claims 1-15 without prejudice. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).